

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on May 10, 2007. A petition for a one month extension of time is submitted herewith. The Director is authorized to charge \$120 for the extension of time and any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-411 on the account statement.

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the title is objected to, Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. In response, Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended, Claims 6 and 12 have been cancelled and Claims 14-16 have been added. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the title is objected to as not being clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse this objection for the following reasons.

Applicants are willing, in the spirit of cooperation, to amend the title in order to address the informalities cited by the Patent Office. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present title, "System, Method and Program to Provide Remote Access to Predetermined Resources," fully complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.72. Since the present title clearly reflects the language of the pending claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the title is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed and is, therefore, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.72.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Patent Office alleges that it is not understood how role information correlates with the present invention. See, Office Action, pages 2 and 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' specification discloses that role information can be included in the certificate describing predetermined privileges permitted to the owner of the certificate. See, specification, paragraphs [0076] and [0077]. For example, the connection unit can be the owner of the certificate. See, specification, paragraphs [0083] to [0086]. The certificate including the role information can be

issued by an appropriate authority. See, specification, paragraph [0081]. Based on at least these noted reasons, Applicants believe that Claims 5 and 11 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,317,838 to Baize ("*Baize*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, a certificate authority for issuing a public-key certificate based on a public-key cryptosystem to each entity constituting the remote access system. Similarly, independently Claims 7 and 13 have each been amended to recite, in part, the step of issuing a public-key certificate based on a public-key cryptosystem to each entity constituting the remote access method or program. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 to recite the elements of dependent Claims 6 and 12. The amendment as discussed above is fully supported in the specification. For example, public-key cryptosystems are used where a transmitter and a receiver use different keys, one key is a public key which can be used by unspecific users, and the other key is a private key, which needs to be maintained confidential. See, specification, paragraph [0037]. Furthermore, public-key certificates are issued to each entity so that each entity can perform mutual authentication. See, specification, paragraph [0138]. In contrast, Applicants respectfully submit that *Baize* fails to disclose or suggest every element of independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 as amended.

*Baize* fails to disclose or suggest issuing a public-key certificate based on a public-key cryptosystem as required, in part, by Claims 1, 7 and 13. For example, *Baize* does not disclose public-key cryptography that uses one public key and another private key. Instead, *Baize* is drawn to submitting remote access requests to a centralized security means and performing authentication using one-time passwords. See, *Baize*, col. 6, lines 3-9 and col. 7, lines 29-31. Moreover, *Baize* does not disclose issuing a public-key certificate to each entity constituting the remote access method or program as required, in part by Claims 1, 7 and 13. For example, public-key certificates are issued to each entity so that each entity can perform mutual authentication, as further defined in new dependent Claims 14-16. See, specification, paragraph [0138]. In contrast, *Baize* discloses filtering requests at a centralized security means and

performing one-time password authentication at a centralized authentication module. See, *Baize*, col. 6, lines 3-9 and col. 8 lines 9-16. In other words, the method as disclosed in *Baize* does not need multiple implementations in each resource to be securely accessed. See, *Baize*, col. 8, lines 9-16. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 7 and 13 and Claims 2-6 and 8-12 that depend therefrom are novel, nonobvious and distinguishable from *Baize*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection with respect to Claims 1-13 be reconsidered and the rejection be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso  
Reg. No. 46,541  
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: September 10, 2007